

### **REMARKS**

This amendment responds to the Office Action dated July 28, 2004.

The Examiner made an objection pertaining to an informal oath being submitted, suggesting that the applicant needed to either submit a new oath that was authenticated by an appropriate diplomatic officer or request the original oath for such authentication. The applicant notes that, in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.68, a declaration was provided along with the originally filed application in lieu of an oath. The submitted declaration conformed to all USPTO requirements. Because authentication by a diplomatic or consular officer is only required for an oath (see 37 CFR § 1.66), the Examiner's objection is not proper.

The Examiner objected to the lack of a "Summary" section in the application as filed. The applicant notes that the USPTO rules do not require a "Summary" section, but instead indicate that such a section is optional. *See, e.g.* MPEP § 608.01(d)(stating that a summary section, *when set forth*, should precede the detailed description and be commensurate with the scope of the invention)(emphasis added).

The Examiner objected to the drawings of the present application, contending that features of claims 27, 34, 42, and 47 are not shown. Claims 27, 34 and 42 have been canceled. Claims 27 and 34 have been replaced with generally similar claims 71 and 84.

Claim 71 corresponds to canceled claim 27. Limitations (a) and (c) of this claim are shown in FIG. 5 at reference numerals 106 and 109, respectively. Limitation (b) of this claim is shown in FIG. 4, reference numeral 84 which shows the command "wcursor='originator'." The specification indicates that this command permits a web browser to confirm the location (i.e. a property) of an input.

Claim 84 corresponds to canceled claim 34, which as originally written included a limitation (c) not shown in the drawings. New claim 84 contains four limitations each of which is shown in FIG. 5, at reference numerals 100, 101, 106, and 112, respectively.

Claim 47, as amended, includes four limitations (a) through (d) which are shown in FIG. 2 as elements 30, 28, 26, and 34, respectively.

The Examiner objected to the language of specified claims. Each of those claims has been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444 (hereinafter Fin). Fin discloses a web browser synchronization system of the type generally disclosed in the applicant's background description of the prior art. Thus while Fin discloses a system that permits multiple browsers to display a synchronized document, and also allows the coarse capability to "share" or "unshare" a document in a local browser, Fin does not disclose a system where specific portions of a shared document include the claimed location attribute.

Independent claim 47, as amended, includes the limitations of a "shared input object" and an "event" associated with the shared input object, "said event including at least one location attribute" that comprises "at least one of: (i) a function conditioning the occurrence of an event on the location of said input; and (ii) a function limiting the location at which an event is to be presented." These limitations are not disclosed by Fin, et al. At best, Fin discloses a location attribute associated with an entire document by a function in which a user of a local browser could "share" or "unshare" a document, i.e. limit the location at which an event within the document is to be presented. See Fin at col. 6 lines 17-24. Fin, however, does not disclose a feature where, once a document is chosen to be shared, an object within that shared document includes an associated event with a claimed location attribute. Therefore, independent claim 47, along with its dependent claims 47-49 patentably distinguish over Fin and should be allowable.

New independent claim 50 includes the limitations of "detecting an input associated with an object in a shared display of a web browser" and detecting a location attribute associated with said object, said location attribute comprising at least one of: (i) a function conditioning the occurrence of an event on the location of said input; and (ii) a function limiting the location at which an event is to be presented." This limitation is not disclosed by Fin, et al.

At best, Fin discloses a location attribute associated with an entire document by a function by which a user of a local browser could “share” or “unshare” a document, i.e. limit the location at which an event within the document is to be presented. See Fin at col. 6 lines 17-24. Fin, however, does not disclose a feature where, once a document is chosen to be “shared”, an object within that shared document includes a claimed location attribute. Therefore, independent claim 50, along with its dependent claims 51-83 distinguish over Fin and should be allowable.

Independent claim 84 includes the limitation of detecting at least one location attribute associated with said event, said location attribute comprising at least one of: (i) a function conditioning the occurrence of an action manipulating a shared object on the location of said input; and (ii) a function limiting the location at which an action manipulating a shared object is to be presented. As stated previously, Fin does not disclose such a location attribute associated with a “shared” object. Accordingly, independent claim 84, along with its dependent claims 85-91 patentably distinguish over Fin and should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 47-91.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kurt Rohlf  
Reg. No. 54,405  
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631